



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## Biblical Notes.

PROF. GEORGE F. MOORE.

ANDOVER, MASS.

1. *Ashteroth Karnaim*. 2. "*The Last Adam*": *alleged Jewish Parallels*. 3. *The Image of Moloch*.

---

1. *Ashteroth Karnaim*, Gen. xiv. 5.

AT the outset it is necessary to say a word about the text, since several recent scholars think that the true reading is **בַּעַשְׁתָּרִית וְקַרְנַיִם**, "in Ashteroth *and* Karnaim."<sup>1</sup> In support of this emendation the Greek and Syriac versions are alleged; but in both cases erroneously. The Aldine (1518) and the Roman (1587) editions of the LXX have indeed Ἀσταρώθ, καὶ Καρναῖν, but manuscript support for this reading is found perhaps only in the small group of Venice minuscules on which both editions named are here based.<sup>2</sup> The conjunction is not found in any known uncial: ADM have ἐν Ἀσταρώθ Καρναῖν; E, καὶ Ναιν or Καίναιν.<sup>3</sup> The cursives which here represent the text of B (16, 77, 131, Cat. Nic.) have Ἀσταρώθ Καρναῖν, as have also those of recensions *L* (Lagarde's 'Lucian') and *M* (inedited). The same reading is attested by all the versions made from the LXX which are extant in this chapter: Coptic (both Memphitic and Sahidic), Old Latin (August.), Armenian, and Arabic. To this array is to be added finally the testimony of the Onomastica (s.v. Ἀσταρώθ Καρναῖν, ed. Lagarde 209<sub>61</sub> 213<sub>39</sub>). In this state of the case, to cite the Roman edition (through Tischendorf or Van Ess) as "*Septuagint*" is a strange inadvertence.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cautiously suggested by Kuenen, *De Melecheth des Hemels*, p. 37 = *Abhandlungen*, p. 207; see also Stade-Siegfried, s.v.; Wellhausen on Amos 6<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> It is to be noted in this connection that many pre-Sixtine edd. of the Latin Bible had *Astaroth et Carnaim*, though all the older manuscripts, edd. Comp., Reg., and the earlier of Stephanus, as well as the Clementine Vulgate, are without the conjunction.

<sup>3</sup> I follow the notation of Lagarde, *Genesis Graece*.

<sup>4</sup> It is worse, when Spurrell actually says that "LXX, Codex Vat. [which begins in Gen. 46], reads Ἀσταρώθ καὶ Καρναῖν."

The support of the Peshitto is no less a broken reed. The Paris Polyglott and after it the London Polyglott have **דבנשתרות וקורנין**, but both the codices (Usher and Pococke) collated in the apparatus to the London Polyglott (vol. vi.) have **קורנין** without the conjunction; this is also the reading of Cod. Ambrosianus and of the Urmia edition, and is properly adopted by Lee.

An objection of some weight to the conjecture **וקרנים** may fairly be made upon grammatical grounds; we should expect the repetition of the preposition, **ויכו את הרפאים בנשתרת ובקרנים**. The cases in which the preposition is not thus repeated (*e.g.* Gen. 14<sup>9</sup>; see in general, König, *Syntax*, § 319 *l*) are hardly parallel.

On the other hand, **Καρναῖν**, 1 Macc. 5, which, there is no reason to doubt, is the **קרנים** of our verse, had a temenos to which the people fled for refuge when Judas advanced against the city (1 Macc. 5<sup>43f.</sup>; Fl. Jos. *Antt.* xii. 8, 4, § 344); and in the parallel passage, 2 Macc. 12<sup>26</sup> (**ἐξελθὼν δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ Κάρνιον καὶ τὸ Ἀτεργάτιον** [**Ἀτεργατεῖον** var.]), the place is described as a sanctuary of Atargatis.<sup>5</sup> There is therefore no reason for departing from the reading of the Hebrew Text and all the versions, Ashteroth Karnaim.

The name **נשתרת קרנים** has played no inconsiderable part in modern discussions of the nature of the goddess Astarte. Many scholars have thought that the "two horns" could be nothing else than the lunar crescent, and thus found in the name a welcome confirmation of the theory that Astarte — at least among the Western Semites — was a Moon-goddess.<sup>6</sup> This interpretation seemed to be supported by the representations of Syrian and Phoenician goddesses with two horns upon their heads; *e.g.* the Baalat of Gebal (Byblos) on the stele of Jechaumelek, the goddess of Kadesh on the Orontes, etc. These figures are obviously modelled after Egyptian types of Isis or Hathor, and the horns (with the solar disk between them) had in their original intention nothing to do with the crescent moon; though they may have been so understood in Syria.<sup>7</sup>

Unexpected light is thrown upon the name Ashteroth Karnaim by a series of votive steles and tablets which were unearthed in 1891,

<sup>5</sup> See W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 292 n.

<sup>6</sup> The reasoning is somewhat illogical; it would be a more natural inference that the "two horns" which give this particular Astarte her name were a distinctive attribute *not* shared by all other Astartes.

<sup>7</sup> See Stade, *ZATW.* vi. 323 f.; E. Meyer in Roscher, *Lex.* 652 f.; cf. Philo Bybl. fr. 2, 24 (*FHG.* ii. 569): **ἡ δὲ Ἀστάρτη ἐπέθηκε τῇ ἰδίᾳ κεφαλῇ βασιλείας παράσημον κεφαλῇν ταύρου.**

near the site of the ancient Carthage, and have been published by J. Toutain in the *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* of the French School at Rome (xii. 1892, pp. 3-124). The inscriptions are in Latin, and date from the latter half of the second century of our era. The dedications, in various formulas, are to Saturnus Balcaranensis; e.g. Saturno Augusto Balcaranensi (18), Saturno Domino Balcaranensi Augusto (17), Deo Magno Balcaranensi (3), etc. The editor, with the concurrence of M. Philippe Berger, rightly recognizes in this Saturnus Balcaranensis a Punic **בעל קרנין**. The location of the sanctuary leaves no doubt as to the meaning of the name. The summit of the mountain on which the sanctuary stood is formed by two very sharp peaks, separated by a deep gorge. On the top of one of these peaks were discovered the remains of a temenos, the site of an altar, and the votive steles and tablets which have been described. The ancient name of the mountain is still preserved in the Arabic Jebel bū Qarnain, "the two-peaked mountain." The god **בעל קרנין** therefore received his designation from the mountain, precisely as in the case of **בעל חרמון**, **בעל לבנון**, etc.; he was the deity of the mountain.

Any lingering suspicion that the name might mean "the two-horned Baal," referring to some such representation of the god as is reproduced by Perrot and Chipiez (*History of Art in Phœnicia and Cyprus*, i. 74), is excluded by the reliefs upon numerous steles in which Saturnus is represented in the usual Alexandrian type, without any trace of horns.<sup>8</sup>

The name **עשתרת קרנים** (read as a sing., rejecting the *bosheth* vowels, 'Ashtereth Qarnaim) corresponds exactly to **בעל קרנים**, of which it is simply the feminine counterpart; and by far the most natural interpretation is, "the goddess of the two-peaked mountain," or of the twin mountain. This is, in fact, the Jewish understanding of the name; the town, we are told, lay between two mountains in a narrow valley.<sup>9</sup> But a stronger support for the interpretation is found in the fact that in the Maccabees<sup>10</sup> the name of the place is simply **Καρναί**; such a shortening of the name is very natural if it was derived from a striking feature in the situation of the city; far less likely if it came from some peculiarity in the representation of its goddess.<sup>11</sup> It is on earth, therefore, not in the sky, that we are to look for the "two horns" of this Batanaean Astarte.

<sup>8</sup> Toutain, *l. c.* p. 103; cf. Plates i-iv.

<sup>9</sup> *Succa*, 2 a, and Rashi *ad loc.*

<sup>10</sup> See also Amos 6<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. **בעל הצור** 2 Sam. 13<sup>23</sup> and **הצור** Neh. 11<sup>38</sup>.

## 2. "The Last Adam": Alleged Jewish Parallels.

In 1 Cor. 15<sup>45</sup> Paul contrasts Adam with Christ: οὕτως καὶ γέγραπται Ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδὰμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν· ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν; and in v.<sup>47</sup>, ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς χοῖκός, ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (cf. v.<sup>49</sup> ἐπουράνιος). Similarly in Rom. 5<sup>14</sup> he speaks of the transgression of Adam, ὃς ἐστὶν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος sc. Ἀδάμ.

Modern commentators on these passages, almost without exception, represent this comparison of the first Adam with the last Adam, that is, the Messiah, as a piece of Paul's Jewish learning. Fritzsche, for example, writes: Videtur autem hanc Messiae appellationem (ultimus, futurus Adamus) non Paulum excogitasse, sed in Judaeorum scholis multum tum temporis frequentatam in rem suam convertisse<sup>1</sup>; while Bloomfield asserts that "nothing was more common with the Jews than to use these very expressions [the first Adam, the last Adam] of Adam and the Messiah."<sup>2</sup>

There is, however, no evidence of any kind that such terms as 'the last, the second, the coming Adam' were current among Jewish scholars in Paul's time as a designation of the Messiah, or that they have ever had any general currency among the Jews. The phrase אַדָּם הָרִאשׁוֹן is, indeed, common in the Talmud and Midrashim, and the corresponding Aramaic אַדָּם קְדִמָּא is found in some of the Targums; but it does not, as Fritzsche supposes, imply a contrast to an *Adamus postremus*; it merely distinguishes אַדָּם as a proper name, Adam, from the indefinite אַדָּם, 'a man, any man, human kind.' An expression corresponding to Paul's ὁ ἔσχατος (δευτερος, μέλλων) Ἀδὰμ has not been discovered anywhere in the voluminous literature of Jewish tradition.

The passages adduced in the commentaries as evidence of the 'rabbinical' אַדָּם הָאַחֲרֵון are all from *Neve Shalom*, book ix.<sup>3</sup> Thus, in ix. 8 (fol. 166<sup>b</sup> ed. Venet. 1575) the author is arguing that

<sup>1</sup> *Comm. in Rom.*, i. 318; cf. 319. See also Meyer on Rom. and Cor.; Sanday on Rom. ("the Rabbinical designation of the Messiah as ὁ δεύτερος or ὁ ἔσχατος 'Ἀδὰμ'"); Grimm, *Lex.* s.v. Ἀδὰμ; et al. More cautiously, Schmiedel on Cor. (*Hand-Comm.*, ii. 202).

<sup>2</sup> *Digest*, vi. 713, on 1 Cor. 15<sup>45</sup> ff.

<sup>3</sup> The references have been copied by one from another without verification so often that certain accidental errors and inconsequences of citation have become part of the learned tradition; the commonest reference, ix. 9, is such an error.

sacrifice, because it teaches the unity and the providence of God, will not be done away in the world to come; **מִפְּנֵי שְׁאָדָם הָרִאשׁוֹן הִתְחִילוּ [הַקֶּרֶבֶן. sc.] וְהָאָדָם הָאַחֲרוֹן בְּשִׁלְמוֹת יְקִימִיּוֹ פְּדֵי לְהַתְמִיד הַשֹּׁפֵעַ הָאֱלֹהִי בְּאוֹמָה וְהָאָדָם הָאַחֲרוֹן הוּא הַמָּשִׁיחַ כְּמוֹ שְׁאָמַר אָדָם הָרִאשׁוֹן** : “Because **אָדָם הָרִאשׁוֹן** began it, and **הָאָדָם הָאַחֲרוֹן** will confirm it in perfection, in order to make permanent the divine influence in the people. The *last man* (Adam) is the Messiah, as it is said, ‘He shall be higher than Moses,’” etc. Then follows a description of the perfections of the Messiah, according to the prophecies. In ix. 5 (fol. 150<sup>b</sup>)<sup>4</sup> we read: The heifer which the Messiah will offer [in distinction from that which Moses offered after the sin of the golden calf] will be an atonement for sin universally, to do away transgression and put an end to the sin of the human race, **שְׁכֵמוֹ שְׁאָדָם הָרִאשׁוֹן הָיָה אֶחָד בְּחַטָּא פֶּן הַמָּשִׁיחַ יִהְיֶה הָאַחֲרוֹן לְהַסִּיר הַחַטָּא לְגַמְרֵי יִתְמוֹ חַטָּאִים מִן הָאָרֶץ שְׂכָלָם יִדְּעוּ אֶת יְהוָה וְגו’** : “As the first Adam was first in sin, so the Messiah shall be the last (*sc.* Adam) to remove sin utterly; sinners shall cease from the earth; for all of them shall know the Lord, from the least to the greatest,” etc. Hereupon follows a comparison of the merit (**וְכוֹת**) of Abraham and Moses with that of the Messiah, who by his greater merit will be able to accomplish completely what they did but partially.

In a third passage (ix. 9. fol. 170<sup>a</sup>), **הָאָדָם הָאַחֲרוֹן**, seems to be, not the Messiah, but the perfect man of the Messianic age, as we might say ‘the coming man.’

The resemblance, especially of the second passage quoted, to Paul’s argument is indeed noteworthy, and the parallel would be still more striking if it were possible to produce the entire context—the first Adam, by whom sin entered into the world, and death by sin; the Messiah, the opposite of the first Adam, who removes sin and restores man’s lost immortality, etc.

But however interesting these parallels may be, they are wholly irrelevant for the purpose for which they are commonly cited; namely, to show that “the last Adam” was used by the Jews in New Testament times as a name for the Messiah. For the book in which they occur was written at the end of the fifteenth century of our era. Its author, Rabbi Abraham ben Isaac Shalom, a Spanish

<sup>4</sup> *Yalkut* on Is. 52<sup>13</sup>, from *Tanchuma* [Par. Toledoth, ed. Buber, fol. 70a].

<sup>5</sup> The folio is falsely numbered 161; numerous other typographical errors in the pagination occur in this first edition.

(Catalan) Jew, is one of the epigoni of the philosophical school of R. Moses ben Maimun and R. Levi ben Gerson. The work itself deals with a wide range of questions, theological and philosophical, physical and metaphysical; Aristotle and the Cabala and Christian controversy jostle one another in it. In the very passage in which we have found the most significant coincidences with Paul's teaching, the author pauses to refute the error of the Christians that the sin of Adam involved all the men of the race, and that its penalty falls upon them all. In a word, the book is not only separated from New Testament times by fourteen centuries, in which Jewish thought had been not less active than Christian, but does not pretend to represent Jewish tradition.

Besides *Neve Shalom*, reference is sometimes made to R. Abraham Seba's (סבא) "*Tseror Hamor*" (צרור המור), a cabalistic commentary on the Pentateuch, written about 1500. This work I have not seen, but from Rhenferd's quotation it appears that in the course of a running analogy between the building of the tabernacle and the creation, Aaron in his priestly robes is compared as אדם אהרן to Adam in his coat of skins. I need hardly say that the cabalistic speculations about the אדם קדמון, or the upper and lower Adams, or the three Adams respectively 'created,' 'formed,' and 'made,' have no relevance to the matter before us.

The history of the quotations from *Neve Shalom* and the use made of them is instructive. They were first brought to light, so far as I am able to ascertain, by Rhenferd (d. 1712)<sup>6</sup> in his *Observationes III. ad 1 Cor. xv. 45-47*, published by Meuschen, *Novum Test. ex Talmude illustratum*, 1736, p. 1048 f. Rhenferd says that אדם הראשון is frequent, "an vero *Secundus Homo* philologis nostris aequè ex magistrorum scriptis notus sit, equidem haud scio." Having thus plainly said that he knew no parallel in ancient Jewish writings,—a testimony which comes with great weight from a man whose rabbinical erudition has not often been surpassed among Christians,—he adduces the passages from *Neve Shalom* and *Tseror Hamor*, as showing that such a conception was not altogether foreign to Jewish modes of thought.

Schoettgen quotes *Neve Shalom* at second hand from Edzard on *Berachoth* i. p. 176, "Quemadmodum Adam primus fuit אדם אחד unus in peccato; sic Messias erit האחרון postremus, ad auferendum

<sup>6</sup> Neither Buxtorf in his *Lexicon* nor Lightfoot in his *Horae* is acquainted with them.

peccata penitus.”<sup>7</sup> From Schoettgen and Rhenferd the passages have been handed on from one generation of New Testament scholars to another, until the “rabbinical doctrine of the second Adam” has become an accepted article of learned tradition, — I was going to say of Christian faith. No one seems to have thought of inquiring when *Neve Shalom* was written or what manner of book it might be.<sup>8</sup>

### 3. The Image of Moloch.

The current descriptions of this idol come through Nicolaus a Lyra (on Lev. 18<sup>21</sup> 2 Ki. 16<sup>3</sup> 23<sup>10</sup>) and the older Protestant commentators (Fagius on Lev. 18<sup>21</sup>, Drusius on Acts 7<sup>43</sup>, etc.<sup>1</sup>) from the mediaeval Jewish commentaries (Rashi on Jer. 7<sup>31</sup>, Kimchi on 2 Ki. 23<sup>10</sup>). These in turn repeat a Midrash which is preserved in two slightly different forms. The first is found in the Yalkut on Jer. 7<sup>31</sup>, where it is quoted from the Midrash Yelamedenu. The Aruch s.v. נִיץ (see also s.v. קִנְקִל) gives the more exact reference, Yelamedenu, Par. Kodashim, end. The Yelamedenu seems to be lost; but in one of the manuscripts collated by S. Buber for his edition of the Midrash Tanchuma the passage quoted in the Yalkut is found in an addition to the Par. Ethchanan (see *Tanchuma*, ed. Buber, Debarim fol. 8<sup>a</sup>; Kohut, *Aruch Completum*, s.v. קִנְקִל). Comparison of the text in the Yalkut, the Aruch (so far as it is quoted there), and the Tanchuma manuscript shows numerous variations; but none which materially affect the sense.

Unlike the other heathen gods, Moloch had his place of worship outside the walls of Jerusalem. His idol stood in the innermost of seven chambers or cells, separated by grated doors (קִנְקִלִין, Low Greek κάγκελλοι).<sup>2</sup> The worshipper who offered a bird was admitted to the first or outer cell; he who offered a goat,<sup>3</sup> to the second; a

<sup>7</sup> Of course Schoettgen, like Edzard and Rhenferd, was under no illusion as to the age and value of this parallel.

<sup>8</sup> Fritzsche gives a reference to Bartolocci, but evidently gave no heed to what he might have learned from Bartolocci.

<sup>1</sup> See also Beyer, Addit. to Selden, *De Dis Syris*, c. vi. 1.

<sup>2</sup> In Echa rab. the word still has its original meaning, ‘gratings, grated doors’; in Yelamedenu it is used of the room within these barriers; cf. the Eng. ‘chancel.’

<sup>3</sup> Tanchuma עֵז; in the Yalkut צֶאֱן, which cannot be right before the following שֶׁה.



sheep, to the third ; a calf, to the fourth ; a young steer, to the fifth ; a bull, to the sixth ; and he who brought his son as an offering alone might enter into the seventh, the presence chamber of the deity. The idol itself had the head of a calf upon a human body ; its arms were extended, with the hands open like those of a man who is about to receive something from another. The image was hollow — we must suppose of metal<sup>4</sup> — and was heated by a fire from within till the hands were glowing. The priests took the child from its father and laid it in the hands of Moloch, where it was burned to death ; the priests meanwhile violently beating drums that the cries of the victim might not be heard by the father and move his heart.

A slightly different version of the Midrash is found in Echa rabbathi, Tumathah (on Lam. 1<sup>9</sup>). As in the Yelamedenu, the idol stood behind seven grated doors, which were opened in order to the worshippers who brought certain offerings.<sup>5</sup> The image seems to be in the likeness of a man — nothing is said of a calf's head ; it holds in its hands a copper pan, beneath which is placed a portable furnace, by means of which the pan is heated. The priests lay the child in the pan, start the fire in the furnace, and shout their acclamations before the father, saying, May it be pleasant to thee ! may it be agreeable to thee ! that the offerers might not hear the crying of their sons and draw back.<sup>6</sup>

There is nothing in the Old Testament to suggest this gruesome description of the idol of Moloch and the peculiar way in which children were offered to him ; nor do we find any traces of either in the Talmud. But — as the scholars of the sixteenth and seventeenth century did not fail to note — we have a striking parallel to the Moloch of the Midrash in certain Greek accounts of the child sacrifices of the Carthaginians. The most familiar of these is in Diodorus Siculus, xx. 14, where the author is narrating how the Carthaginians, beaten and besieged by Agathokles, sacrificed to Kronos no less than two hundred boys of the highest birth, while three hundred others voluntarily presented themselves. He continues, *ἦν δὲ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀνδριὰς Κρόνου χαλκοῦς, ἐκτετακὼς τὰς χεῖρας ὑπτίας ἐγκεκλιμένος ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, ὥστε τὸν ἐπιτεθέντα τῶν παίδων ἀποκυλίεσθαι καὶ πίπτειν εἰς τι χάσμα πλήρες πυρός.* A similar description of the image of Kronos is

<sup>4</sup> According to Rashi, of copper.

<sup>5</sup> The series of offerings is here: fine flour, turtle doves or young pigeons, a lamb, a ram, a calf, a bull, a son.

<sup>6</sup> See also Kimchi on 2 Ki. 23<sup>10</sup>, in whose description both sources seem to be used.

preserved in the scholia to Plato's *Republic*, i. 337 A, on the words ἀνεκάγχασέ τε μάλα Σαρδάνιον (ed. Bekker, vol. ix., p. 68) : Κλείταρχος δέ φησι τοὺς Φοίνικας, καὶ μάλιστα Καρχηδονίους, τὸν Κρόνον τιμῶντας, ἐπὶ τινος μεγάλου κατατυχεῖν σπενδῶσιν, εὐχεσθαι καθ' ἑνὸς τῶν παίδων, εἰ περιγένοιτο τῶν ἐπιθυμηθέντων, καθαγεῖν αὐτὸν τῷ θεῷ. τοῦ δὲ Κρόνου χαλκοῦ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐστῶτος, τὰς χεῖρας ὑπτίας ἐκτετακότες ὑπὲρ κριβάνου χαλκοῦ, τοῦτον ἐκκαίειν τὸ παιδίον. τῆς δὲ φλογὸς τοῦ ἐκκαιομένου πρὸς τὸ σῶμα ἐμπιπτούσης, συνέλκεσθαι τε τὰ μέλη, καὶ τὸ στόμα σεσηρὸς φαίνεσθαι τοῖς γελῶσι παραπλησίως, ὥς ἂν συσπασθὲν εἰς τὸν κριβανὸν παρολίσθη. In briefer form Suidas and Photius (s.v. Σαρδάνιος [or Σαρδόνιος] γέλως) have the same description in the name of Kleitarchos. Kleitarchos, then, one of the popular biographers of Alexander the Great, who wrote probably ca. 310–300 B.C., is the oldest author to whom we can trace the description of the image of Kronos. The passage in Diodorus xx. 14 is very probably taken by him from Duris of Samos in his history of Agathokles, written ca. 280 B.C.<sup>7</sup>; but a comparison of this passage with that from Kleitarchos makes it clear that the latter is the remoter source of the description which Diodorus copied; the change of Kleitarchos' κριβανὸν into a χάσμα πλήρες πυρός is made for the sake of bringing in the quotation from Euripides which follows.

There is a passage in Plutarch, *De Superstitione*, c. 13, which in another way presents a parallel to the Jewish description of the worship of Moloch. The Carthaginians, he says, used to sacrifice their own children, and those who had no offspring of their own used to buy children from the poor and slaughter them, as if they were lambs or birds. The mother stood by, unmoved, without a groan; if she groaned or wept, she lost the price, but the child was sacrificed none the less; κρότον δὲ κατεπίπλατο πάντα πρὸ τοῦ ἀγάλματος ἐπαυλοῦντων καὶ τυμπανίζόντων, ἔνεκα τοῦ μὴ γενέσθαι τὴν βόησιν τῶν θρήνων ἐξάκουστον.

It is hardly conceivable that the description of the idol of Moloch at Jerusalem, with his outstretched and upturned hands in which the

<sup>7</sup> The reasons for supposing that Duris is Diodorus' source here may be briefly stated: In the history of Agathokles, Books xix., xx., Diodorus draws chiefly, if not exclusively, on Timaeus and Duris; Timaeus is here excluded, because the same paroemiographic tradition which has preserved the extract from Kleitarchos adduces Timaeus for an entirely different explanation of the Σαρδάνιος γέλως. On the other hand, the way in which the quotation from Euripides (*Iphig. Taur.* 625 f.) and the myth of Kronos devouring his children are brought in is altogether in the manner of Duris, the extant fragments of whose works (*FHG.* ii. 466 ff.) show a notable fondness for such embellishments.

victim was roasted to death (over a furnace, *Echa rab.*), while the priests drowned its cries with noise of drums or loud shouts, is independent of these Greek stories, — that the striking coincidences are purely accidental. It is far more probable that the authors of the Midrash borrowed their notions of Moloch and his worship from Greek sources. The Old Testament represents the offering of children by fire to Moloch as one of the enormities of the Canaanites; what more natural than that, when Jewish scholars came upon accounts of the sacrifices of the (Canaanite) Carthaginians such as we have read, they should take them for authentic descriptions of the Moloch worship at Jerusalem?<sup>8</sup> Through what channels the Greek story came to them, it is of course impossible to tell. But it may be worth while to remark that Kleitarchos' account had, so far as we can judge, unusually wide currency from the fact that it gave an historico-etymological explanation of the proverbial 'sardonic laughter.' It has been preserved to us in the paroemiographic tradition, from which the Plato scholion quoted above is itself derived.<sup>9</sup>

The Greek story itself is perhaps a pseudo-historical variation of an older myth, referred to by Simonides and Sophocles. The paroemiographers put by the side of Kleitarchos' explanation of the *Σαρδάνιος γέλως* the myth of Talos, the brazen giant made by Hephaistos, who guarded the island of Crete for Minos, and destroyed intruders by claspng them in his burning embrace, having first made himself hot by leaping into the fire.<sup>10</sup> Some older scholars were inclined to think that this myth grew out of actual human sacrifices to a 'Phoenician Moloch' such as are described in Diodorus. The converse is more probably the true relation. It is curious to note that several of the writers who describe the idol of Moloch at Jerusalem after a Lyra imagine that the arms of the image were drawn up and the victim pressed to its breast.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Observe the juxtaposition into which Euseb. *Praep. evang.* iv. 16, 24–26, brings Diod. xx. 14 with the child sacrifices of the Canaanitized Israelites, Ps. 105<sup>37–39</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> Note the name of Tarraios a little further down. On the relation of the scholia to the writers on proverbs, see Leutsch and Schneidewin, *Paroemiographi Graeci*, Praef., p. xiv ff.

<sup>10</sup> See Eustath. on Od. xx. 302 (p. 1893); Schol. on Plato, *Rep.* l. s. c.; Photius; Suidas; Zenobius, Cent. v. prov. 85; Apollon. *Argon.* iv. 1638 ff.; D. L. Mercklin, *Die Talos-Sage und das Sardonsche Lachen*, 1851 °; Boettiger, *Ideen zur Kunstmythologie* i. 358, 380.

<sup>11</sup> So Dietzsch in Ugolini, *Thes.* xxiii. 868; Ziegra, *ib.* 903; and others.

The calf's head in the younger version of the Midrash may perhaps be due to a confused reminiscence of the Minotaur, which some modern scholars have brought into connection with the myth of Talos. The theory that the figure of the Minotaur was itself borrowed from a Semitic 'Baal-Moloch' is rightly rejected by Helbig (in Roscher, i. 3010 f.).